

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 36, NO. 17

March 15, 1943

WHOLE NO. 968

## REVIEWS

LATTIMORE, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs (*Sullivan*); SMITH, Tiberius and the Roman Empire (*Rogers*); COLSON, Philo 8, 9 (*Philips*); DOUGLAS, Robe (*Gummere*); BOOTH, New Testament Studies (*Miner*); HAUSRATH, Corpus Fabularum Aesopiarum I.1 (*Hale*); LAWLER, Latin Club<sup>5</sup> (*Luck*); SKEMP, Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues (*Winspear*)

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

THE LIBRARY OF  
CONGRESS  
SERIAL RECORD

MAR 22 1943

Copy 1

## LONGMANS' CLASSICAL READERS

### GREEK LITERATURE IN TRANSLATION

Edited by W. J. Oates and C. T. Murphy, both of Princeton. Bibliography on Influence of Greek Classics, by C. S. Osgood and F. R. B. Godolphin.

Selections from the works of fifty-six classical Greek authors, in the versions of sixty-two translators, topically arranged.

**Ready**, July 1943. **About** 930 pages. Introductions. Map and frontispiece. Glossary. **About** \$4.50.

### LATIN LITERATURE IN TRANSLATION

Edited by Kevin Guinagh, Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, and Alfred P. Dorjahn, Northwestern University.

Selections from the works of twenty-eight classical Latin authors, in the versions of eighty translators, chronologically arranged.

1942. 822 pages. Introductions. Biographical notes. Bibliographies. Map. Glossary. \$4.00.

**LONGMANS, GREEN & COMPANY**

**55 FIFTH AVENUE**

**NEW YORK CITY**

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 36 contains issues dated: October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 16, 30; December 7, 14 (1942); January 11, 18, 25; February 8, 15; March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; April 5, 12; May 10, 17, 24; June 7 (1943).



## COMING ATTRACTIONS

### MARCH 19 Saint Louis University

CLASSICAL CLUB OF SAINT LOUIS

Panel discussion on vitalizing high school Latin

Leader: Mrs. Del Martz, Wydown School, Clayton

### MARCH 26-27 Holy Cross College

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

President: Goodwin B. Beach, Hartford

Vice-President Professor Cornelia C. Coulter, Mount Holyoke College

Secretary: Professor John W. Spaeth, Wesleyan University

Chairman of Local Committee: Rev. John C. Proctor, Holy Cross College

Executive Committeemen: Professor George M. Harper, Jr., Williams College; Miss Edythe F. Reeves, High School, Cranston, Rhode Island; Mr. Arad E. Linscott, Deering High School, Portland; Professor Dorothy M. Robathan, Wellesley College

Participating: Mr. Bernard M. Allen, Cheshire Academy (Non Modo and Some Other Multiple Negatives); Ensign Walter Allen, USNR (What We Don't Know about Catullus); Dean Roscoe Pound, Harvard Law School (The Humanities in an Absolutist World); Mr. Henry Harmon Chamberlin, Worcester (Dame Rumor and the Giants); Rev. Edward G. Callahan, Lenox, Massachusetts (The Sense of Tradition in Classical Study); Rev. William Fitz-Gerald, Cheverus Classical High School, Portland (The Classics in War-time); Miss Dorothy Gardner, High School, Greenwich (Random Remarks from a Latin Classroom); Professor William Chase Greene, Harvard University (Some Ancient Attitudes toward War and Peace); Professor Moses Hadas, Columbia University (From Nationalism to Cosmopolitanism in Ancient Thought); Miss Dorothy Park Latta,

New York University (The American Classical League and its Work); Dr. George A. Land, High School, Newton (Nonessentials Such as Chaucer and Latin); Mr. Robert W. Meader, Cooperstown, New York (Modern Latin Composition); Rev. John C. Proctor, Holy Cross College (An Historical Investigation of the Concept of Arete in the Iliad and Odyssey); Professor Leslie F. Smith, University of Maine (Verres: Nomen or Cognomen?)

### APRIL 30 - MAY 1 Philadelphia

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

President: Miss Edna White, Dickinson High School, Jersey City

Vice-Presidents: Professor Ernest L. Hettich, New York University; Professor Franklin B. Krauss, Pennsylvania State College

Secretary-Treasurer: Dr. John F. Gummere, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia

Executive Committee: Professor H. B. Ash, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Thelma B. DeGraff, Hunter College High School; Professor Donald Blythe Durham, Hamilton College; Professor Moses Hadas, Columbia University; Miss Julia Jones, Tower Hill School, Wilmington; Lt. Robert S. Lyle, Sidwell Friends School, Washington; Miss Helen S. MacDonald, Friends Select School, Philadelphia; Dr. Walter N. Myers, Camden High School; Major Henry T. Rowell, The Johns Hopkins University; Sister Marie-Victoire, College of St. Elizabeth; Miss Esther M. Smith, Peabody High School, Pittsburgh; Dr. Bluma L. Trell, Hunter College.

### MAY 27-28 Cedar Crest College

ANTIGONE OF SOPHOCLES

Members of the Classical and Philological Associations are invited. For tickets, apply well in advance to Professor J. A. Tallmadge, Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pennsylvania.

# REVIEWS

**Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs.** By RICHARD LATTIMORE. 354 pages. The University of Illinois Press, Urbana 1942 \$3.50

This handsome volume is the outgrowth of a doctoral dissertation written in 1934 under the direction of Professor W. A. Oldfather. Eight years of further research have broadened the scope of the original study and enriched the author's knowledge of his material. Dr. Lattimore has wisely narrowed his subject to "those statements in the epitaphs which illustrate the attitude of the ancients towards death, and their interpretation of the problem it presents." After an Introduction on the style of the epitaphs, there follow chapters on the interpretation of death, the Underworld and cult of the dead, the causes of death, figures employed to describe death, the pagan elements in Christian epitaphs, and finally a general conclusion.

This is an admirable piece of work in a field of research both vast and difficult. It should prove a delight to all who are interested in the views of the ancients regarding death and the Beyond. To begin with, it is an immense advantage to have a single work dealing with both Greek and Latin epitaphs. Thus one may readily remark the obvious resemblances as well as the interesting differences between the two. Again, Lattimore consistently gives the place where the epitaphs were found, and frequently also their dates. This is important, as both themes and style differ greatly with time and locale (cf. the article in *TAPhA* 70 (1939) 503-14). Moreover, though he has naturally drawn upon the work of scholars like Rohde, Cumont, Lier, Van Bleek etc., the author has thought out the problems for himself and often dissents from the views of others (e.g., 48, note 199). Some scholars stretch the epitaphs to the breaking point to prove a belief in immortality. This reviewer was gratified to find that Lattimore's views were in substantial agreement with results arrived at by himself in an (unpublished) dissertation (*Ideas of After-life in the Latin Verse Inscriptions*. Johns Hopkins Diss. 1936). Occasional differences of opinion are to be expected in the interpretation of records so deeply human and so numerous. For instance, I think that the pages (65ff.) on "*Sit tibi terra levis*" would have been even better than they are had the author consulted Hartke's excellent monograph. Again, I wonder whether all expressions like *si sunt Manes, si quid sapiunt inferi* are really expressions of genuine doubt. Occasionally, at any rate, they seem to express a hope that, however, lacked positive proof. Brelich's assertion that "*la forma ipotetica no fa che rafforzare il pensiero*" seems warranted in some (but not all!) cases.

The discussion of the *di Manes* (90ff.) is not clear-cut. I believe that more stress should be laid on the fact that, about Augustus' time, the words came to

mean the particular spirit of an individual and not merely the vague herd of the dead. Exactly why and how this came about is still mysterious. But an examination (made by the reviewer) of the names on early prose epitaphs and on verse epitaphs which employ the words *di Manes* of a particular dead person seems to show that it was predominantly eastern folk who did this. From this I suspect that it was these people who gave the old familiar words a new meaning and made it popular in the Roman world. This opinion seems confirmed by Lattimore's remarks (97) on the Greek "hero" as a counterpart of the Roman *di Manes*, and also by Virgil's occasional use of the word *Manes* in this sense (cf. Bailey, *Religion in Virgil*, 256ff.).

The chapter on "Pagan Elements in Christian Epitaphs" is very interesting. It shows clearly that, while "much of the language of classical epitaphs . . . was preserved" in Christian epitaphs, none the less "the young faith did succeed in developing an idiom to express its own interpretation of death, an idiom which is found in most of the simpler epitaphs, even in many of those affected by the classical style."

With the author's general conclusion I agree wholeheartedly: "From the evidence of epitaphs the belief of the ancients, both Greek and Roman, in immortality, was not widespread, nor clear, nor very strong." *Ibant obscuri per umbras*. It took long years before the *nox perpetua* of the Roman poet gave way before the *lux aeterna* that brightens certain Christian epitaphs. The evidence of the epitaphs is not always clear or complete, and should therefore be supplemented by the testimony of literature and archaeology. But the story the stones tell is interesting, intensely human, and valuable. For having told it so well the author of this present study deserves the gratitude of all.

FRANCIS A. SULLIVAN, S. J.

ST. ANDREW-ON-HUDSON

**Tiberius and the Roman Empire.** By CHARLES EDWARD SMITH. v, 281 pages. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge 1942 \$2.75

Following an Introduction which resumes briefly Augustus' reign and Tiberius' rôle therein, Professor Smith discusses Tiberius and his reign in eleven chapters: I The Accession of Tiberius; II The Mutiny of A.D. 14; III The German Campaigns; IV Germanicus in the East; V The Trial of Piso; VI Sejanus; VII The Retirement to Capri and the Fall of Sejanus; VIII *Lèse Majesté* Prosecutions under Tiberius; IX War and Peace in the Provinces; X Relations with the Senate and the Administration of Italy; XI Economic Conditions During the Reign of Tiberius.

The author seems to this reviewer to be at his best in those sections of the narrative which comprise mili-



tary activities, that is, Chapters II, III and IX. The final chapter also is satisfactory. But with the large problems of the reign, the ascension and the constitutionality of the actions preceding it, the conspiracies, the major criminal trials, the death of Drusus, the character of Tiberius, he is much less successful. He seems sometimes in fact unable or unwilling to decide definitely one way or the other on some of these questions, even the most crucial.

Was Tiberius sincerely disinclined to rule or not? "Disinclination to accept the burdens of sovereignty might well have been sincere" (29). But on the other hand: "There is no reason to believe that he was sincere in his protestations of unwillingness to rule" (34).

Was Drusus assassinated or did he die a natural death? "Sejanus certainly was implacably resolved to avenge the insult" (of Drusus' striking him) (121). "Passion had driven (Livilla) into the arms of Sejanus, and it was probably this illicit relationship that made her willing to encompass Drusus' death (122). But then one reads: "The evidence of Apicata, therefore, cannot be regarded as proof that Drusus' life had been sacrificed to the plottings of Sejanus and Livilla . . . Livilla, it was reported, had been spared by the emperor, but her mother, Antonia, ordered that she be starved to death. . . . Such a punishment, if actually meted out to Livilla, would have been sufficiently accounted for by the charge that she had been in adulterous relations with Sejanus, and in any event it does not constitute proof that Drusus died the victim of a poison plot" (123). But then again it is said that "drachms struck at Caesarea in Cappadocia in 33-34, and 34-35, which bear the likeness of Drusus . . . likewise commemorated the discovery of the real cause of Drusus' death (124 note 33). But then once again on the other hand: "The charge that (Sejanus) had consummated a successful poison plot against Drusus . . . seems incredible on the basis of existent evidence" (152), and "the alleged murderers of Drusus" (180). As regards Livilla, it is to be noted that this interpretation follows Dio to the rejection and exclusion (by implication) of Tacitus. Tacitus records the *damnatio memoriae* of Livilla; that cannot but mean conviction of high treason, which is irreconcilable with Dio's story that Livilla was spared by Tiberius and put to death by Antonia. Dio has elsewhere another story that Livilla was still alive in the reign of Claudius. Tacitus must be preferred to Dio.

Is Germanicus' conduct in the mutiny justifiable or not? "This was indeed an ignominious strategem, but, in view of the precarious position of the prince, it may have been justified as a desperate expedient" (48). Yet on the other hand: "Indeed, Germanicus, with a prompt and unflinching demonstration of authority . . . might have been able to suppress the revolt without resort to the expedients of the bogus letter and the

dangerous concessions, etc." (50). And "The success of Manius Ennius . . . inclines one to the conclusion that the commander-in-chief . . . could at least have had as much success had he attempted sterner measures, etc." (55).

It is not clear on page 14 and in note 13 whether Smith considers that Tiberius acted constitutionally between Augustus' death and his own accessions, as Hohl, or that his actions were usurpation, as Herzog. But later (23) he seems to decide for the latter.

"The question whether Sejanus really had conspired against the emperor is difficult to decide," Smith writes (152); he appears to conclude (153) that he had not, but that Tiberius had to overthrow him because "the succession of Gaius would be threatened by the presence of so powerful a figure close to the throne." To deny the historical fact of Sejanus' conspiracy is to fly in the face of a unanimous tradition which includes Valerius Maximus, Philo, Josephus, Tacitus, Juvenal, Suetonius, Dio, the inscriptions and the coins. Marsh admitted "conspiracy" but believed it was against Gaius, not against Tiberius. That interpretation seems not to have won acceptance; Smith's is even less convincing by far.

The author accepts (172, n. 27) the demonstration (TAPA 64 [1933] 18-22) that suicide did not obviate confiscation in treason cases; but in the cases of Piso (114), of the adherents of Sejanus (150) and of Silius (175), all of which were trials for treason, he seems to expect it to have that effect.

One reads in the author's preface that "Not all recent views and interpretations have been accepted, however, simply because they happen to be challenging or novel . . . The author, therefore, has attempted to avoid the mistake of considering the last word as necessarily the true one, and has endeavored to present an account of the reign which to him seems most closely to approximate the truth." But it is difficult to understand how Agrippa Postumus' execution can at this late date be seriously laid to Livia (16), especially after Hohl's article in *Hermes* 70 (1935), which appears in Smith's bibliography but is not cited in his narrative of the episode; how the case of Crematius Cordus can be considered to have involved no more than the opinions expressed or implied in his history, after Marsh, *The Reign of Tiberius*, 290-293; or how the Tacitean account of Tiberius' attitude in the case of Granius Marcellus (*Annals* 1.74) can be accepted at face value, after Marsh, 110 and note 2 (the same view more fully in Rogers, *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius*, 9f.). And there are other instances similar.

There is not infrequently manifest a wholly inadequate control of the Latin source material. It is misleading at the very least to render Tacitus' "Nam Tiberius cuncta per consules incipiebat" by "in every

action of Tiberius the first steps had to be taken by the consuls" (14). Scaurus' remark at the time of the accession is paraphrased: "Tiberius thus far had not used his tribunician power to veto consular acts"; (32) Tacitus is clear that Scaurus referred only to the consular proposal to elect Tiberius emperor. "A two-day adjournment then was declared for the formulation of the charges" (110) in the trial of Piso is a serious mistake in the narrative of the trial process. Tacitus wrote: "Exim biduum criminibus obiciendis statuitur, utque sex dierum spatio interiecto reus per triduum defenderetur." Smith has completely mistaken the meaning of *obiciendis*. "The emperor declared that 'he had resolved on slightly rigorous measures against a lady who accused him of murder by poison,'" (131f.) violates the meaning of Tacitus' "non mirum ait, si quid severius in eam statuisset, a qua veneficii insimularetur," and makes of a future possibility a past decision. The quotation from the letter on the case of Messalinus (177) is distorted by the omission of the conditional clause. Sejanus was never praetor (119); he received the ornamenta praetoria. Similarly Poppaeus Sabinus was not decreed a triumph (194); he received the insignia only. The vows "offered to Tiberius, which were also granted to Nero and Drusus" (125f.) were of course the vota pro incolumitate principis, addressed to the gods of the state.

Smith, following Liebenam, cannot understand Germanicus' *renuntiatio amicitiae* declared late in his relations with Piso—"A strange procedure to say the least. Why, in view of all that allegedly happened between them, should Germanicus now renounce friendship with Piso?" (99, note 106). The incomprehension rests ultimately on a clause of Tacitus, which as printed by almost all the editors, reads thus: "discesseruntque (*sc.* Germanicus and Piso) *apertis odiis*" (Annals 2.57). *Apertis* is an emendation of Lipsius for the MS. *opertis*. Many years ago, F. H. Cowles pointed out in this journal (20 [1926-7] 84f.) most convincingly that the emendation should never have been made, and that with the manuscript reading the whole story of Germanicus' immediate relations with Piso is sensible.

There are very numerous errors of fact in detail, of which these few are representative. The triumphal arches by the temple of Mars Ultor (95) honored not Tiberius and Germanicus but Germanicus and Drusus. Of the case of Votienus Montanus the author writes (176): "The defendant was convicted and 'suffered the penalties of treason,' apparently death"; but death was not the normal penalty for treason, and Jerome records that Votienus died in exile. "In 21 Ancharius Priscus accused Cassius Cordus of corrupt practices in Crete, but apparently failed to prove his case. Some years later, however, Priscus secured conviction of the same defendant for extortion in Cyrene" (206). But Crete and Cyrene were one province; the supposed two cases were

one case; the action in 21 was indictment only, not trial; the lapse of time was only one year, apparently an adjournment to allow the collection of evidence. "Two intestate bequests" (221) is surely a contradiction in terms; and one case was not intestacy at all, but a question of an authentic earlier will and a later forged will.

Yet a cursory reading of the volume will make a not unfavorable impression; and the general reader will obtain a picture of Tiberius that is not unjust; the thorough, scholarly student of Tiberius will use it with the greatest caution.

The reader will be saved some perplexity perhaps, if he is informed in advance that *infra* in the footnotes with perfect impartiality means either "above" or "below."

There is a fourteen-page bibliography and an eleven-page index.

ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS

DUKE UNIVERSITY

**Philo** with an English Translation by F. H. COLSON in ten volumes. Volumes VIII and IX. xxiv, 458; x, 547 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Heinemann, London 1939, 1941 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50 each

Publication of the eighth and ninth volumes in Professor Colson's series brings the able and distinguished translator toward the close of his long labors over Philo Judaeus. The present volume gives evidence of the same careful scholarship with which readers of earlier volumes are familiar, and contributes to Greek scholars another sound text of an author. One cannot pretend that Professor Colson's English rendering is anything but a sound, honest piece of work, without any particular grace of style other than clarity. Neither is Philo's Greek the most elegant in the world. After all, he was attempting the difficult feat of bringing over the abstractions of a foreign people, and, according to Professor Goodenough, trying not to be too explicit about some of it.

Volume Eight contains a brief preface and a General Introduction. The works translated and provided with an outline are: On the Special Laws, Book IV, On the Virtues, On Rewards and Punishments. Appendices to each contain bibliographical and exegetical notes of material to be found in both ancient and modern literature. These are particularly stimulating.

Volume Nine presents six essays entitled: Every Good Man is Free, On the Contemplative Life, On the Eternity of the World, Flaccus, Hypothetica (or Apologia pro Iudaeis)—extracts made by Eusebius, and probably genuine—and On Providence (fragmentary). To each is prefixed an Introduction; appendices complete the volume. There are no indices. Professor Colson re-

gards these essays as of less merit than the contents of the earlier volumes, and remarks that they probably owe their preservation to the interest and respect created by Philo's main work. Nevertheless they testify to the versatility of his mind, and they have been translated into English more frequently than have any other parts of Philo's writings.

The text of the Greek of both volumes is based on Cohn and Wendland's edition, the Flaccus (and, to appear in Volume Ten, Legatio) being the work of Reiter. The translator has made use of the German translation published in 1906. Lexicographers will find, in different appendices, abundant material for study in the illuminating discussions of the meaning of certain words and phrases.

Volume Nine is dated March 1941, and being "Printed in Great Britain," presumably won, in company with other valued products of the Islands, safe passage across a hostile Atlantic.

HENRY PHILLIPS, JR.

PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY

**The Robe.** By LLOYD C. DOUGLAS. 695 pages. Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston 1942 \$2.75

In order to do justice to this best-selling novel, I must say at once that certain parts of it are admirably written, particularly those in which the application of Christian principles to ordinary life is exemplified by incidents in the lives of the characters.

It has been the author's idea to write a story about the robe of Jesus and what became of it after His crucifixion. Mr. Douglas is at his best when telling a straightforward tale of humble sincerity, and one is repeatedly struck with the fact that he comes very close to writing a story that would appeal equally to old and young.

The book is unquestionably overwritten and would bring its message equally well in half the number of pages. The style is sometimes annoying: She tried to invade his eyes but the bridge was up (8). He explored the inside of his cheek with a defenceless tongue (588); his cheeks bulged with a surmising tongue (635), etc.

But the student of the classics will have his attention drawn to the fact that many of the scenes are laid in Rome or elsewhere in Italy, and that very frequent and detailed references are made to Roman life and customs.

Even the most casual reader will wonder at the fantastic way in which the author has depicted the Romans and their customs, and at his complete disregard for facts.

To begin with, the author knows not the first thing about the Roman name with the result that the characters usually bear impossible or non-existent names. Moreover, the form of proper names may be un-

changed Latin, as *Marcus*, or Italian, as *Arpino*, or Anglicized, as *Lucan*, or incorrect in any language as *Formia*. *Gallio* is supposed to be a cognomen, *Lucan* a nomen, *Paula* a praenomen, *Kaeso* a cognomen. One girl is named *Diana*.

The hero's name will give the reader pause: *Marcellus Lucan Gallio*. He bears the title of "Tribune" throughout the book (Mr. Douglas has been reading Lord Lytton, evidently) and thus gives us a man with an impossible name and an impossible title as the central figure of the story.

The houses of the wealthy in Rome of the first century A.D. are supposed to have circular stairways (43), and one of the favorite meeting places of any and all characters is the pergola, a word which Mr. Douglas might look up some time.

A slave draws water for a bath (247); another carries a shield and a spear everywhere and, on the slightest provocation, does a salute by bringing the spear-butt to his chin. We are not told what happens to bystanders, furniture, or ceiling, when he does this indoors. A Greek priest in a cassock is met on page 200, copper denarii on 220, a "public chariot" is referred to on 165. Oranges appear on 519, 552. The *Via Novo* (sic!) is supposed to intersect the *Via Sacra*, and both are said to be paved with Numidian marble (508). The senatorial costume includes a broad sash with silk tassels (513). The *Via Appia* crosses the Tiber (656), Capua is on the seacoast (572), dancing choruses in the Forum Julium were part of the celebration of the *Ludi Romani* (680).

But further details (and there are a hundred more) need not be given. The question raised is this: does the author of such a book have an obligation to be even reasonably accurate when dealing with ancient times? I feel quite sure that if someone else wrote a book and put the "fertile crescent" on the Hellespont, or Jerusalem on the seacoast, Mr. Douglas would be outraged (and rightly, too). Another question is whether the firm which publishes such a book has a responsibility to edit it.

Lest I seem to condemn the book too harshly, I refer the reader to my opening paragraphs.

JOHN F. GUMMERE

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA

**New Testament Studies.** Critical Essays in New Testament Interpretation, with Special Reference to the Meaning and Worth of Jesus. Edited by EDWIN PRINCE BOOTH. 290 pages. Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York 1942 \$2.50

A title like this suggests a group of heterogeneous essays with little more in common than concern for the same field of study. And that inference is justified, al-



though the eleven authors share academic and theological backgrounds. All are related, either as alumni or as teachers, to Boston University School of Theology. All have adopted the critical methods of modern Protestant scholarship, although they vary in their fidelity to those methods. Their theological orientation is in the main that of humanitarian liberalism, which stresses the normative importance of the historical Jesus as perfect Teacher-Example. Two tangents away from this circle of ideas may be noted: a tendency toward extreme rationalism and scepticism in Walter Bundy's essay; and a slight leaning toward post-liberal theology on the part of Clarence Tucker Craig and Thomas Kepler. Because these essays just named are the most provocative ones, we will deal more fully with them.

Walter Bundy attempts to dissociate sharply dogma from history in the gospel of Mark, on the assumptions (1) that the two can be cleanly sundered, (2) that dogma is purely subjective and history purely objective, and (3) that objective data alone are of primary value. Because the residuum of such data is very small, Bundy concludes that Mark is "basically dramatized dogma" belonging to the realm of "religious theory not to the actualities of the history of Jesus." Most scholars will agree that Mark, like John, is a theological interpretation of history. But they will insist that the Marcan myth depends for its truth-value precisely upon its historical rootage. How hard it is for rationalistic historicism to do justice to such documents as Mark!

Professor Craig attacks the thorny problem of the messianic consciousness of Jesus, asking whether any clear solution can be reached. And his answer is negative. Scholars of unquestioned standing applying the same methods to the same data arrive on opposite sides of the fence. In the nature of the problem no conclusive evidence is available. Consequently, the decision in most cases will depend upon the religious outlook of the interpreter. Professor Craig defends the position that "Jesus did believe that his own life was identified in some way with the coming Son of Man." Yet he maintains that the opposite conclusion would not undermine Christian faith in Jesus as Christ.

Thomas Kepler's task is a fresh analysis of the forms in which the oral tradition about Jesus became crystallized. Accepting the basic perspective of European Form Critics, he suggests a new classification of forms according to the dominant motif. The gospel of Mark is a form of preaching, the gospel of Matthew a form of teaching. Within the gospels, shorter pericopes may be classified as wonder narratives, kingdom parables, and "preaching stories which show the mind of Christ." The reader will find these distinctions suggestive but neither sharply drawn nor amply documented.

In the volume as a whole, formgeschichtliche rather than religionsgeschichtliche method predominates. An essay by D. T. Rowlingson presents a competent review

of recent literary and form criticism, with a thumbnail sketch of the techniques of the latter. F. D. Gealy discusses the impact of Form Criticism upon the problem of authenticity and vigorously defends the fundamental fidelity of the records to the spirit of Jesus. These studies in oral traditions may be of interest to classicists engaged in similar studies in Greek or Roman culture. Of potential value to linguists is the study by E. A. Leslie of the Aramaic language and its influence upon the New Testament.

The essays do not deal directly with the salient theological issues of the day, in spite of the fact that those issues involve radically different treatments of the scriptures. In fact, most of the essays lack clear-cut ideological perspective. Two contemporary ethical issues are treated: "Jesus' attitude toward race and his attitude toward war." But on these subjects nothing new is said; perhaps nothing new can be said.

All in all, the book is probably a fair cross-section of American scholarship in the Biblical field. We specialize in anthologies and digests rather than in creative discipline and mature synthesis. We publish capsules of knowledge, superficial and uncoordinated fragments of materials, rather than steel beams riveted together into an enduring structure. Perhaps the chief deficiency in this collection is that none of the subjects chosen can be dealt with adequately in the few pages allotted.

PAUL S. MINEAR

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE

**Corpus Fabularum Aesopicarum.** Edidit AUGUSTUS HAUSRATH. Volume I, Fascicle 1. xl, 208 pages. Teubner, Leipzig 1940 7.05 M.

This initial fascicle contains 181 of the 289 prose fables included in the *ordo fabularum*. In the second part of Volume I the author plans to publish the rest of these prose fables and to add the fables of Aphthonius, Ps.-Dositheus, Syntipas, and late rhetoricians. Volume II is to appear under the editorship of J. Gerstinger, including fables in verse, the Bodleian paraphrase, the Life of Aesop, and whatever else is pertinent to these subjects. Hausrath himself plans to put out another book entitled *Aesop, Geschichte der handschriftlich überlieferten griechischen Fabelsammlungen*, in which he will treat the origin of the Aesopic fables, the various manuscripts and their interrelations, and the subrecension of Class I (known as Ia), publishing therein the fables of Ia and "multa quae iure desiderantur" (xxv).

Anonymous prose fables ascribed to Aesop (exclusive of the Bodleian paraphrase, coming from Babrius) have come down to us in three principal recensions. Of these three the oldest, most extensive, and therefore presumably the most important is Class I

("Augustana"). It is the basis in large part for the two recensions which followed it, namely Class II ("Vindobonensis") and Class III ("Accursiana"). There is also, as has already been mentioned above, a subrecension of Class I which is designated as Ia and is a slight paraphrase of I. Class II is an inferior revision of I; while Class III is a reworking of parts I and II by some humanistic scholar. Hausrath prints the versions of I, II, and III separately, a practice already followed by Chambry (*Aesopi fabulae*, Paris 1925) to good purpose.

Within Class I Hausrath discerns correctly three main branches (viii). CFCas, OE, and A are the representative manuscripts which he arranges in this order of importance for establishing the text of this recension.<sup>1</sup> Professor Perry in his review of this same book<sup>2</sup> has discussed among other important topics Hausrath's failure to classify Cr correctly, pointing out that CFCas (= λ originating about the thirteenth century) goes back for the most part to the same source as ACr (as early as the tenth century) while OE represents a parallel tradition. In a recent detailed study of the manuscripts of Class I, I have found some evidence that S comes from a source close to A and Cr. See the following readings where A and S stand together against the rest: 9.7 *μόνην ἐπιθυμίαν* and 11 *ἐγκλίνας* where Hausrath wrongly has Cr=A; 153.1 *ἐπιτυχόν;* 22.11 *αὐτὸν ἡξίωσεν* where H. wrongly reports BBa=AS; 158.10 *δημηγόρους* and for a fable not included in H.'s first fascicle see Chambry's text 274.7 *πωληθῆναι*. A liberal reviser, much of the time with no decisive authority, in his peculiar phraseology the scribe of S tends to establish the integrity of the testimony now of A, now of Cr, to the text of CrA. Like all the other manuscripts S is useful to an editor at times.

Hausrath does well in selecting Havn., Harl., K, and D as the best representatives of the original form of Ia. Havn. is the only one of these four which I have not studied. I think that a provisional stemma is possible for this subrecension although Hausrath claims not to have progressed to that point (xxv). K, D, Harl., A, R, and Q clearly draw their Ia material from a manuscript (which we may call φ) descended from the Ia archetype, but containing some errors presumably not in the Ia archetype. L, as far as its Ia material is concerned, drew on a source earlier than φ. This appears in the

epimythium of 113 and the fable of 112. KDHarlARQ omit this epimythium and fable, placing the epimythium of 112 immediately after the fable of 113. L avoids this omission and at the same time is independent of ACr, OE, and CFCas. Within the group descended from φ there are two main subdivisions: that including K, D, and Q, and that including Harl., A, and R. K and D seem to have come from the same manuscript for the most part. K and D only have the glosses *ἐν ἡγῶν χοῖρον* (Har. 5.4) and *προησθέντας ἡγῶν προχαρέντας* (Hsr. 13.9). There is evidence in several places of an error in KD, copied by K but corrected by D. Besides, K and D have a number of unique readings in common. The Ia fables of Q show greater kinship in readings to KD than to HarlAR. In the other subdivisions of descendants of φ, A and R seem to originate from the same manuscript. This manuscript contained at least 46 conflations of readings from Classes Ia and III which have been copied into A and R. Harl. is free from these conflations but stands with AR against KDQ in other places.

Any theory about the relationships among the manuscripts of Class I, however correct it may be, is only one aid toward recovering the original text of this recension. One must bear in mind also the habits and individual peculiarities of each scribe,<sup>3</sup> the general style of the fables, and the grammar and the sense of a passage. These four bases of judgment are of about equal value, one being used at one time, another at another. When the editor has to make up his mind about variants of otherwise equal likelihood, he may then resort to the representatives of the oldest demonstrable archetype available in the given passages. Most of the time, however, establishing the text of Class I resolves itself into the democratic process of determining the majority, whether or not AC, CFCas or some others are in the minority.

It is evident then that an editor has to have good common sense. This prime requisite Hausrath has had. Now and then he has shot wide of the mark, but most of the time he gets as close to the original Augustana text as we can with our present knowledge. His good judgment, incidentally, overruled his alleged preference for CFCas, and he has made relatively little use of this trio as a principal guide. He has ventured more emendations than Chambry, often with good results, and in general the text has been accurately printed, but there are numerous slips.

Sometimes readings found in all or almost all the manuscripts which have the fable in question have been omitted from the body of the text without comment. In addition to the passages listed by Professor Perry there are the following examples: 114.9, *ἀλλ'* before *εἰ τότε* occurs in all manuscripts (CrAECCas), but it is

<sup>3</sup>E uses plurals, but omits *ἐστὶ* and *εἶναι*. CFCas substitutes *ὑπολαβὼν* for *ὑποτυχών*.

<sup>1</sup>The following table of equivalents may prove helpful since Hausrath's symbols are not the same as those of Chambry and Perry:

Cr=G 10th cent.	V=Pi 14th cent.
A=Pb 13th or 14th cent.	B=Ma 15th cent.
E=Pa 12th cent.	Ba=Mo 15th cent.
O=Pc 14th cent.	K=Pf 15th cent.
C=Pg 15th cent.	A=Me 15th cent. (not to be
F=Mb 14th cent.	confused with A=Pb above)
Cas=Ca or W 13th cent.	R=Mf 15th cent.
S=Pd 15th cent.	Q=Mj 15th cent.
U=Pe 15th cent.	L=Ph 15th cent.

<sup>2</sup>Classical Philology 37 (1942) 210-1.



omitted from the text with no note in the apparatus; 131.11 *πολλάκις* after *ὀφελείν* is in all manuscripts (CrEAL), but not in the text; 125.1, *κολοῦν*, which follows *ἄλλων* in CCrABBa (omitted only in EO), is omitted in the text without note.

The apparatus is the least satisfactory feature of the book. It is incomplete even for the manuscripts of Class I as the following passages (all different from those cited by Professor Perry) illustrate: 116.1, C, as well as F, has *κατακολουθῶν*; 119.1, E also reads *ἐπὶ κέρασιν*; 145.3, Cr and O also read *ἀρνείσθαι*; 148.1, "*δὸλφ* *hups servavit* E," says Hausrath, but it is also in Cr; 148.8, CrACE all have *ἀλόγως* for *ἄλογος*, but there is no note on this; 148.9, *κατασκευῇ* (for *παρὰ*) AC, but not noted; 157.5, Cr's *ἔως* for *ὥς* may be right, is at any rate noteworthy, but is not mentioned; 164.10, F, as well as ACr, reads *ἡ ἀλήθεια*; 173.9, *ἐργων* "Schn(eider) *fort. recte*," notes H., but *ἐργων* is the reading of his favorite manuscript, C, which is not quoted; 175.3, ACr also read *ἐποφθαλμῶν* with OEa; 179.5, *περιῶν* is omitted also in F, as well as in CBBa; 179.7, Hausrath fails to cite *ἀπολώλεκας* of CF in place of *ἀπώλας*; 181.1, O also reads *ἀλλήλας* with E; 181.2, the variant *στειλάμενα* of FOECr is not mentioned.

Besides being incomplete the apparatus is often misleading. Instances are numerous: 103.1, on *καταστήκει* the note says "*καταστήσειν* BBa," but the reading of all the other manuscripts (COEACr) is *καταστήσαι*, which is nowhere mentioned; 103.2, *ἐν* is only in BBa, not in COEACr, but there is no note; 104.5, *ὄσον*, but he does not say that all the manuscripts except BBa have *ὄσσην*; 104.7, *μὲν* is only in Ia, but no note; 117.1, all manuscripts save BBa have *ἐπὶ* for *εἰς* (BBa), but no note; 125.8, except AC none have the Byzantine form *ἀπολιμπάνοντες*, reading *ἀπολιπόντες* (CrEO); 132.7, *στρατιῶται* is an error for *στρατηγοὶ* found in all the manuscripts; 136.6, instead of *διότι* (before *ὑπὸ*) all the manuscripts read *ὅτι*; 145.2, *ἐκδοῦναι* of the text is only in E, the rest reading *ἐκδοῦναι* (probably an instance of a misprint); 154.11, the word order *γίνεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* is peculiar to A, whose scribe likes to change the order, but no note; 156.3, again A has an unnoted peculiar word order (*ἄγριαι αἶγες*); 158.6, *προορώμενα* in the text is only in BBa, and yet there is no note concerning the readings of the main tradition (CrEA); 174.10, all manuscripts read *οὕτω πολλοῖς*, but Hausrath has *ὅτι πολλοῖς* without any note.

The apparatus also has a large number of misreports of manuscript readings of which the following are representative: 104.2, CEA read *ποιήσουσι*, not *ποιήσωσι*, and O reads *ποιήσουσι* with *αι* (or *ως*?) written above; 105.6, E<sup>1</sup> does not omit *πάντων δέ*; 107.3, C does not agree with A but with Cr; 107.7, *οἰκείων* is not due to Reiskia but is in A, which reads *οἰκείων ὁστών*; 107.18 (end of note), Cr reads *ὀργίλους καὶ*, not *ὀλίγους καὶ* as stated; 111.1, O does not read *διαθέσεις* as stated,

but *διανοίας* with CCrA; 117.3, both A and Cr read *καὶ δὴ ἀνάψας* after *ἐβουλήθη* (*ἡδυνήθη* A) (both manuscripts are here misreported); 117.7, E reads *δῆξει αὐτὸν* (no *εἰς*); 117.10, C reads *φθ. τούτοις αὐτοῖ* (not *αὐτὸς*), though this is probably a misprint; 119.7, C reads *ἀφείλετο*, not *ἀφῆκεν* with E; in 123.2 there is no *νομίσαι* in Cr, as Hausrath seems to have inferred from Pb; 125.5 (note), O does not read *εἰς*, but *πρὸς*; 125.9, O reads *τὰς ἁλλοδαπὰς*, not *τὴν -ην* (this error is also in Chambry); 130.4, BBa read *ὅστις*, not *ὅτι*. C reads *ὅστις* also (not *ὅτις*), and so does E (*ὅστ'ς sic*) (such trifles could well be omitted from an apparatus, but when given should be given accurately); 135.7, CF read *ἀναχατίζόμενος φ.*, not *-ίζων φ.*; 145.2, C reads *ἐκδοῦναι*, not *ἐπιδοῦναι*; 145.5, *ἄξιον* is not omitted by A as stated (Chambry makes the same erroneous statement); 146.6 (note), C reads *γλωσσώδη*, not *γλωσσαλγῇ*; 147.8, E reads *καλῶς*; 149.9, O reads *τὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν* (*sic*), not *τὰς ἐαυτῶν*.

CLARENCE B. HALE

WHEATON COLLEGE, ILLINOIS

**The Latin Club.** By LILLIAN B. LAWLER. Bulletin XII, fifth edition, revised and enlarged. vi, 65 pages. American Classical League, New York 1941 \$0.50

This book has its existence because of the stress placed by modern educators on learning by doing and because of the consequent appeals from teachers everywhere for ample guidance. The Latin club has ceased to be an adventure of probable value; it is now "an accepted institution in most of our senior and junior high schools of the country." Incidentally, this reviewer has chosen to think of the club activity as an adjunct of secondary education, the field of her interest, even though the author intended that the book should be helpful to any language teacher, especially to any Latin or Greek teacher.

If each Latin club is to be of real value, then there is need for much guidance from the accumulated experience and knowledge of one like the author of The Latin Club. She gives freely of her great gifts, pointing a clear way to what is desirable, and, on the contrary, depicting how, without intelligent leadership, our effort may "degenerate into a purely social organization, with practically no connection with the classics."

Given time and a place for meeting whatever group is to be organized into a club activity, questions of organization arise: What will the name of our club be? Shall we have a motto? How many officers will our club need? Shall we draw up a constitution? Shall we invite to our club all students and teachers who have ever studied Latin? There is no detail of organization omitted in the careful discussion given; in fact, the trivia of club pins and colors, yes, even of a password,

a yell or song—those trifles which loom so large to a young student in his feeling for his organization—are well treated.

Singularly significant are the injections of good fun this reviewer found in various portions of the book; for instance, there is the humorous Latinization of names which really does make its "peculiar appeal to the adolescent mind"—Capellior (Kidder), Stulti-filius (Simpson). In like humorous vein the students will name their teachers; at least mine promptly dubbed me Fortuna because their salutation 'Miss Fortuna' was so appropriate of my place in their existence.

A thorough analysis of worthwhile activities and projects for the club follows. Naturally, many conditions affect the plans to be drafted. If the activity is based on each month's especial appropriateness in Roman life, there is to be found a September-to-June catalogue of events; but if the club is to be used for broad purposes, such as furnishing an occasional assembly program or radio "hour" (literally, ten or fifteen minutes on a School-of-the-Air program), again, no perplexed teacher or student committee need search in vain. In this book are helps for style shows, farces, stunts, and puppet shows, as well as for radio, open house or assembly programs.

Mention is made, too, of the dramatization of stories read in class. This reviewer has found that activity valuable, especially when interested and capable students could write the script, either in Latin or in English. Likewise there are many games and songs listed; but here again, as in the realm of pseudo-poetry and recordings, students take pride in exhibiting their ingenuity.

Reading as a club activity is made appealing because of an excellent bibliography which Dr. Lawler has supplied. The thirteen bibliographies in this book are so copious that even though a teacher might not be able to arrange an outside club activity, especially in these days of emergency and amid crowded curricula, she would find them of inestimable value in plans for class work.

KATHRYN LUCK

HIGH SCHOOL, DANVILLE, INDIANA

**The Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues.** By J. B. SKEMP. xv, 123 pages. University Press, Cambridge; Macmillan, New York 1942 \$2

This interesting study challenges that school of Platonic interpretation which sees in the doctrine of 'ideas' or 'forms' the essential kernel of Plato's teaching and refuses to admit substantial development or modification in the Platonic doctrine. Skemp is concerned to trace the development of the concept of *κίνησις* in the later dialogues and to exhibit Plato as the substantial originator of the 'cosmological argument' which influenced so much of European mediaeval thought. The

starting point of Skemp's essay is provided by recent discussion in Britain of the later Platonic dialogues; in particular the author is expressing an attitude to the work of Professors Taylor and Cornford. But the interest of his theme has a much wider appeal than the relatively narrow circle which follows British Platonic controversy. Skemp is tracing the evolution of Plato's thought from the impersonal and abstract metaphysician of the earlier dialogues to the personal theologian of the *Timaeus* and the *Laws*. He is exhibiting in other words the movement of Platonic thought which has influenced so profoundly the development of Christian theology. Unfortunately, in view of the importance of his subject, one is compelled to note that the extreme compression of Skemp's somewhat elliptical style, his tendency to assume the arguments of Taylor and Cornford, his fondness for using a mixture of Greek and English in his sentences, his habit of referring to passages in ancient authors without quoting them in full, will tend to repel that wider audience which might otherwise find much stimulation in his discussion. Even the classical reader will find it difficult to follow his argument without the Greek text of the Platonic dialogues at his elbow.

There is much in Skemp's study for which one can be grateful—not least the share which he contributes to the rehabilitation of the *Timaeus* as against Professor Taylor's dismissal of it as "only a compendium of historical information concerning Empedoclean biology and Pythagorean mathematics" (65). Though when Skemp describes an account in the *Timaeus* as the "best account that reason can give of the forces of unreason and their work in the visible universe" (27) and the *Timaeus* itself as "the achievement of a rational cosmology" (68), the reviewer can only note that tastes in rationality evidently differ.

While welcoming Skemp's argument in general one is forced to note that in details it is not always as convincing as one could wish. This is particularly true in his account of the influence of Ionian thinkers on Plato's later thought. On page 8, for example, the author argues that the "blatant *petitio principii*" in the *Phaedo* "proof" of the immortality of the soul, resting, the author hold, on "the axiom that τὸ ἀθάνατον is ἀνώλεθρον could be regarded as axiomatic alike by one who held the Orphic faith and by one who believed in a divine φύσις like the everliving fire of Heraclitus." This is to find agreement on that rarefied plane of abstraction where all oppositions are reconciled. And yet this assumption seems to be his only basis for the conclusion on page 10, "These two elements, then, Orphic ψυχή and the Ionian φύσις unite in the term τὸ αὐτὸ κινεῖν," and the doctrine is assumed as proved on page 24. The tenuousness of the argument is all the more disappointing because I am convinced that in essence the author is right in his view that the

later dialogues represent a more sympathetic attitude to the position of Heraclitus; that when Socrates in the *Theaetetus* (153 c) argues that "motion is a good and rest an evil to the soul as well as the body," he is not simply setting up a straw man to knock down, but is beginning to deal sympathetically with the world of motion and change. (On page 29 Skemp quotes with approval Natorp's judgment on the Philebus: "Es ist sehr zu beachten, dass hiermit zum ersten Mal in dieser Deutlichkeit, das Werden ganz positiven Sinn erlangt.") Yet the author's treatment of this central question is not firm. In the very first sentence of his exposition he warns his readers "To speak of Plato's later philosophy of motion is not to imply that he held an earlier doctrine and modified it in the cosmology of the *Timaeus* and the natural theology of the *Law*." But on page 25 he speaks of a "reassertion of the *Phaedo* position, that in changeless (and, therefore, motionless) being alone is perfection."

A similar uncertainty in dealing with a problem of great importance appears in the author's treatment of Alcmaeon. In a footnote (28, note 2) Skemp reviews briefly the evidence for the relation of Alcmaeon to the Pythagorean school and concludes, "but in fact he was probably not a Pythagorean at all." On page 43 he speaks of the "older tradition of the earlier unorthodox Pythagorean Alcmaeon." So much recent exposition of the Pythagorean school as 'progressive scientists' turns on the position of Alcmaeon that one is entitled to ask for clarity on this point. Incidentally, to say that "it was not the doctrine of *ἰσονομία* in which Alcmaeon stood closest to the Pythagoreans" (38) seems a distinct understatement.

Space permits me to suggest only one or two places where the argument does not entirely carry conviction sometimes because of the sheer compression of the author's style. On page 7 I do not get from reading the *Phaedo* passage to which he refers (102a-107b) the impression that "Socrates is made to encourage Simmias's hesitation at the end of it" nor can I agree that Plato seems to be insisting "that the only unquenchable argument for immortality is Socrates himself."

I cannot agree with the picture of the 'philosopher king' in the *Politicus* "who can be above law and modify law because he is the master of the art of government." *Nómos* in the *Politicus* argument seems to mean tradition and custom rather than law and the significance of the argument to me is Plato's realization that political forms are relatively unimportant if a 'wise' lawmaker will preserve tradition or modify it in accordance with developing social and class interest.

The author's exposition of his conception of the *εἰκὼς λόγος* is too brief to carry conviction. The phrase *τὴν σὺ νόῳ δέκρεν μὴδ' ὁμμασιν ἥσο τεθιπῶς* (57) does not prove that the *φιλότης* of Empedocles is an ideal principle. A materialist, ancient or modern, would agree

that physical laws must be mentally apprehended.

The author does little to clear up the ambiguities inherent in the word *ψυχή* which makes so much of Greek idealistic thinking superficially plausible, but on analysis absurd.

One regrets, too, that the author has confined his attention to *κίνησις* as a cosmological concept and neglected its social and political implications. (It is the one place where the author does suggest a political genesis for Plato's thought he is at best unclear and at worst wrong. "The doctrine of *κίνησις* belongs to the later group of critical dialogues which begins with the *Theaetetus*. This doctrine, therefore, may be regarded as a development of Plato's thinking in the years of the established Academy, when the disaster to his Sicilian expedition had driven him to look deeper . . . into the sources of these regular laws and abiding motions . . .") The author seems to accept Dr. Sachs' date for the *Theaetetus*, 368 or early 367. It must, therefore, have been written *before* Plato's departure for Syracuse in 367.

In rejecting or at least modifying Proclus' analogy between the contrary revolutions of the *Ouranos* in the *Politicus* myth and the contrary movements of the *Same* and the *Other* in the World Soul of the *Timaeus* (78) the author neglects an important clue to the social relevance of Plato's later thinking and, to use a homely American phrase, casts out the baby with the bath water. The *Politicus* is above all the dialogue from the later group which reveals the theoretical political aspects of Plato's thought, the intellectual response of Plato and his *ἐταῖροι* to the new conditions which the battle of Leuctra introduced and the revealed bankruptcy of Sparta made imperative for Greek conservatives. As long as Sparta stood to provide the keystone of their social position, the emphasis of such as Plato was on the preservation of the status quo. After Leuctra, they were forced to look for a new base of power and launch themselves on the 'wave of the future.' We find the political intrigues of members of the Academy in Syracuse, in Macedon, in Thrace, in Heraclea on the Pontus and even further afield. *Κίνησις*, change, became increasingly important as a political and social need. This will perhaps suggest one reason why it should become important as a cosmological and metaphysical concept. Lacking any such social relevance as this, the author's study remains within the patterns of traditional idealism. He deftly follows Plato into that empyrean of abstract thought where disembodied ideas meet, jostle, clash and modify each other for no apparent reason. Hence verbal similarities and abstract reconciliations assume for him an excessive importance.

The reviewer noted one misprint, movents for movements, page 70, line 14.

A. D. WINSPEAR

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN



## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

Microfilm or photostat copies of articles abstracted may be obtained through Bibliofilm Service, Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D. C. The charge for a microfilm copy of any periodical article, regardless of length, is 50c; film copying from books and serials is at the rate of 50c for each 50 pages or fraction thereof. Photostat charges are 10c per page, with a minimum charge of 50c for each item. The Service reserves the right to except material readily available elsewhere.

## ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

HANFMANN, GEORGE M. A. *Etruscan Doors and Windows*. The round-headed doors, flanked by similar windows, which are found in early Etruscan tombs and were probably used in Etruscan houses, are so far unparalleled in Greece or in pre-Etruscan Italian dwellings. "There is a possibility that these forms represent a Near Eastern trait imported by the Etruscans." But whether or not these forms can be used as an argument for the eastern origin of the Etruscans, they reveal "an early interest in Italy for the possibilities of arcuated forms, an interest that was later fully realized in Roman art, and, through Roman heritage, transmitted to the Early Christian and the Italian Romanesque." *Journal of the American Society of Architectural Historians* 2 (1942) 8-16 (C.T.M.)

ROBINSON, DAVID M. *New Greek Bronze Vases: A Commentary on Pindar*. Pindar's references to prizes of bronze may be illustrated by hydrias such as the one from Aigion now in Baltimore. The handle is finished

above in the form of the upper half of a female figure. Form and style date it about 450 B.C. It is compared with similar vases or handles in New York, Boston and Berlin, and with a hydria of similar shape in Providence, which an inscription shows was a prize in Pindar's own city of Thebes. The development of this type of handle is traced; the style seems to have died out about 425 B.C. In the same grave at Aigion was found a pair of gold earrings, of a type which has generally been assigned to Hellenistic times. However a terracotta mould from Olynthus shows similar earrings, and this dates from the end of the fifth century. The earrings are probably contemporary with the hydria. A bronze oinochoe, also from Aigion, attests the cult of Aegeus there; Aegeus was also worshipped at Thebes, and Pindar himself was an Aegeid (cf. *Pyth.* v, 75ff.). Ill.

AJA 46 (1942) 172-97

(Walton)

WALLACE, MARY. *Sutor Resutus*. The examples of sculptured footwear prior to 300 B.C. alleged by Dr. Bieber to show the notch or incurving between the great and second toes, fail to destroy this criterion of date. None of the Attic grave steles actually show this incurving, while the Roman copies are notoriously inaccurate in such minor details, and are therefore unacceptable as evidence. Ill.

AJA 46 (1942) 366-7

(Walton)

WHITTEMORE, THOMAS. *The Unveiling of the Byzantine Mosaics in Hagia Sophia in Istanbul*. Ill.

AJA 46 (1942) 169-71

(Walton)

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Compiled by Lionel Casson and Bluma L. Trell from such bibliographical publications as reach this country, and from books received at the editorial offices. Prices have not been confirmed.

## LITERARY HISTORY. CRITICISM

DUCKWORTH, GEORGE ECKEL. *The Complete Roman Drama*. 2 volumes: 951, 971 pages. Random House, New York 1942 \$6

ELIOT, T. S. *The Classics and the Man of Letters*. 27 pages. Oxford University Press, London 1942 8 d.

GOODSPEED, E. J. *A History of Early Christian Literature*. 338 pages. University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1942

GRENE, DAVID. *Three Greek Tragedies in Translation*. 237 pages. University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1942 \$2.50

GRILLO, GIACOMO. *Two Aspects of Chivalry: Pulci and Boiardo*. xi, 59 pages. Excelsior Press, Boston 1942 \$1

IVES, SAMUEL A. and HELMUT LEHMANN-HAUPT. *An English Thirteenth-Century Bestiary. A New Discovery in the Technique of Mediaeval Illumination*. 45 pages, 8 figures. H. P. Kraus, New York 1942

KLEBERG, TÖNNES. *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum et Latinorum Bibliothecae Gotoburgensis*. v, 48 pages, 6 figures on plates. Elander, Göteborg 1941

LARRABEE, STEPHEN A. *English Bards and Grecian Marbles. The Relationship between Sculpture and Poetry Especially in the Romantic Period*. xiii, 312 pages, illustrated. Columbia University Press, New York 1943 \$3.50

LITTLE, ALAN M. G. *Myth and Society in Attic Drama*. xi, 95 pages, illustrated. Columbia University Press, New York 1942 \$1.50

## HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

FICHTER, J. H. *Saint Cecil Cyprian, Early Defender of the Faith*. 282 pages. Herder, St. Louis 1942 \$2.50

HOWE, LAURENCE LEE. *The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian*. xiii, 141 pages. University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1942 \$2

LATTIMORE, RICHARD. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. 354 pages. University of Illinois Press, Urbana 1942 \$3.50

PEARSON, LIONEL. *The Local Historians of Attica*. xii, 167 pages. American Philological Association, Philadelphia 1942 (Philological Monographs, Number XI) \$2.25

POWELL, DILYS. *Remember Greece*. New Edition. Hodder, London 1942 7/6

REITHER, JOSEPH. *World History at a Glance*. 446 pages, maps. Garden City Publishing Co., Garden City 1942 \$0.69

SMITH, CHARLES EDWARD. *Tiberius and the Roman Empire*. v, 281 pages. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge 1942 \$2.75

WHITE, G. W. and E. C. KENNEDY. *Roman History, Life and Literature*. 349 pages. Macmillan, London 1942 6 s.

## EPIGRAPHY. NUMISMATICS. PAPYROLOGY.

PAGE, D. L. *Greek Literary Papyri. I: Texts, Translations and Notes*. xix, 618 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Heinemann, London 1942 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50